

REMARKS

In response to the Examiner's election of species requirement, Applicants elect Group I, Claims 1 to 10.

Applicants respectfully traverses the requirement. The Examiner States that
5 the product (gearset support) can be used in OEM item and therefore certain steps such as removing the drive shaft would not be necessary in this instance.

In order to justify a restriction, material differences must exist. The major component, the support, may be used in new construction and the fabrication and installation process is essentially the same with the exception of removing the existing
10 drive shaft. Machining the case to accept the support, installing the support and associated bearings, installing clutch and gear assembly and propellor and placing the top cover on the upper case are common to both new and modified construction.

Thus, the product (support) is used in the same manner, in both the new product and retrofit environment. Accordingly, it is submitted that the requirement by withdrawn.

15 The objection to the drawings as filed has been noted and replacement drawings accompany this Response.

A petition fee for a one month extension is also attached. It is noted that the date for Response fell on Sunday, July 6, 2003. Accordingly, mailing on July 7, 2003, accompanied by a Certificate of Mailing is timely.

A favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Gregory J. Nelson, Reg. No. 22,066
NELSON & ROEDIGER
Attorneys for Applicant
3333 E. Camelback Road, Suite 212
Phoenix, AZ 85018
(602) 263-8782

5

10